



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/820,694	03/30/2001	Helen H. Zhu	015290-502	7374

7590

12/04/2002

Peter K. Skiff  
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.  
P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

MALDONADO, JULIO J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2823

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/820,694

Applicant(s)

ZHU ET AL.

Examiner

Julio J. Maldonado

Art Unit

2823

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 September 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. The non-final rejection as set forth in paper No. 7 is withdrawn in response to applicants' amendments.
2. A new 103(a) rejection is made as set forth in this Office Action.
3. Claims 21-23 are newly added. Thus, claims 1-23 are pending in this application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

In reference to claim 1, applicants cite "...introducing a semiconductor substrate into a plasma etching reactor, the semiconductor substrate having a layer of silicon nitride and an underlying and/or overlying dielectric layer...". But according to the specification (page 5, line 20 – page 7, line 5) there's no dielectric layer underlying the semiconductor substrate. Appropriate correction is required

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hung et al. (U.S. 6,380,096) in view of Kim et al. (U.S. 6,362,109 B1).

In reference to claim 1, Hung et al. (Figs.2-10) in a related method to perform a plasma etching to a silicon nitride layer for a copper damascene teach the steps of introducing a semiconductor substrate (10) into a plasma etching reactor (Fig.2), the semiconductor substrate (10) having a layer of silicon nitride (12, 16) and an underlying and/or overlying dielectric layer (14, 20); supplying etching gas to the plasma etching reactor and energizing the etching gas into a plasma state, the etching gas including at least one fluorocarbon reactant and at least one oxygen reactant supplied to the plasma etching reactor at a flow rate ratio of oxygen reactant to fluorocarbon reactant of 1.5 or less; etching the exposed portions of the silicon nitride layer (12, 16) with the plasma so as to etch openings in the silicon nitride layer (12, 16) with the plasma while providing an etch rate selectivity of etching rate of the silicon nitride layer (12, 16) to the etching rate of the dielectric layer (14, 20) (column 8, line 27 – column 12, line 4).

Hung et al. fail to expressly teach that the rate selectivity of the nitride layer to the etching of the oxide layer is at least about 5. However, the parameters used for etching the silicon nitride (e.g. etchant flow rate, bias power, pressure and temperature) layer falls in those of the claimed invention. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to appreciate that the etch

selectivity of the nitride layer over the etch selectivity of the oxide layer is at least about 5.

Still, Hung et al. fail to teach using a medium density plasma etching reactor. However, Kim et al. (Figs.1-3) in a related method to form a high-aspect ratio hole teach etching silicon nitride and silicon oxide in a medium density plasma reactor (40) (column 4, line 43 – column 6, line 26). Also, Kim et al. teach performing said etching process on a high density plasma etching reactor (column 7, lines 20 – 23). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to etch the silicon oxide layer and the silicon nitride layer as taught by Kim et al. in the plasma etching process of Hung et al., since this would allow the formation of high-aspect ratio interconnects and high selectivity over other layers formed on the substrate (column 4, lines 11 – 30).

In reference to claims 2-12, Hung et al. teach that the dielectric layer (14, 20) comprises an undoped silicon oxide (column 2, lines 30-35); the at least one fluorocarbon reactant is represented by  $C_xF_yH_z$ , wherein x is at least 1, y is at least 1 and z is equal to or greater than 2 (column 11, lines 52-56); the etching gas is nitrogen-free and the flow rate ratio of the oxygen reactant to fluorocarbon reactant is 1 or less (10/10 sccm for  $O_2/CH_2F_2$  and 5/30 sccm for  $O_2/CH_3F$ ) (see Hung et al. table 6-7); the etching gas consists essentially of  $CH_3F$ , oxygen and optionally argon as a carrier gas (see table 7); the silicon nitride layer (12, 16) overlies or underlies an organic low-k dielectric material (column 13, lines 12-20); the openings are 0.25 micron or smaller sized openings and/or via wide open trenches (column 13, lines 2-6); and the plasma

reactor (Fig.2) comprises a dual frequency parallel plate plasma reactor having a showerhead electrode and a bottom electrode on which the substrate (10) is supported, the bottom electrode being supplied RF energy at two different frequencies or the showerhead electrode being supplied RF energy at a first frequency and the bottom electrode being supplied RF energy at a second frequency which is greater than the first frequency (column 3, lines 42-65).

In reference to claims 13-15, Hung et al. teach applying an RF bias to the semiconductor substrate (10) during the etching step (see table 6); overlying the silicon nitride layer (12) over an electrically conductive layer (11) comprising a copper or aluminum (column 8, lines 30-35); wherein the etching step is carried out as part of a process of manufacturing a damascene structure (see Figs.3-10).

In reference to claim 16, Hung et al. teach the steps of forming a photoresist layer as a masking layer (98), patterning the photoresist layer to form a plurality of the openings and the etching step forms via or contact openings (104) in the silicon nitride layer (12, 16).

In reference to claims 17-19, Hung et al. teach that the silicon nitride layer (12) is between an overlying dielectric layer (14) and an underlying copper layer (11), the copper layer (11) being exposed to the plasma in the openings during the etching step (column 11, line 48 – column 12, line 4); that the fluorocarbon reactant is a hydrogen-containing fluorocarbon and the etching gas supplied to the plasma reactor does not include nitrogen as a component thereof (see table 6); that the plasma reactor (Fig.2) is at a pressure of 15mTorr during the etching step (see table 6); and the semiconductor

Art Unit: 2823

substrate (10) comprises a silicon wafer supported on a bottom electrode and the bottom electrode is maintained at a temperature of 15°C during the etching step (see table 5).

In reference to claim 20, Hung et al. fail to show that the temperature of the bottom electrode is maintained at a temperature of 20 to 50°C during the etching step. However, The selection of the claimed range is obvious because it is a matter of determining optimum process condition by routine experimentation with a limited number of species. In re Jones, 162 USPQ 224 (CCPA 1955)(the selection of optimum ranges within prior art general conditions is obvious) and In re Boesch, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980)(discovery of optimum value of result effective variable in a known process is obvious).

In reference to claims 21 – 23, Hung et al. in combination with Kim et al. teach using a reactor comprising a capacitively coupled plasma reactor at a pressure above 80 mTorr, wherein the fluorocarbon reactant is supplied at a flow rate of 20 to 40 sccm and the oxygen reactant is supplied at a flow rate of 20 to 40 sccm (Kim et al., column 6, lines 5 – 31).

### ***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Papers related to this application may be submitted directly to Art Unit 2823 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Art Unit 2823 via the Art Unit 2823 Fax Center located in Crystal Plaza 4, room 3C23. The faxing of such papers must conform to the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (15 November 1989). The Art Unit 2823 Fax Center number is **(703) 305-3432**. The Art Unit 2823 Fax Center is to be used only for papers related to Art Unit 2823 applications.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Julio J. Maldonado** at **(703) 306-0098** and between the hours of 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM (Eastern Standard Time) Monday through Friday or by e-mail via [julio.maldonado@uspto.gov](mailto:julio.maldonado@uspto.gov). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Olik Chaudhuri, can be reached on (703) 306-2794.



Art Unit: 2823

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the **Group 2800 Receptionist** at **(703) 308-0956**.

***Julio J. Maldonado***

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2823

703-306-0098

julio.maldonado@uspto.gov



Olik Chanchud

Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2800